1		HEARING MORE TO HEAR LESS: A SCOPING REVIEW OF HEARING AIDS FOR TINNITUS RELIEF
2		dr. Laure Jacquemin ^{1,2} , Prof. dr. Annick Gilles ^{1,2,3} , Prof. dr. Raj Shekhawat ^{4,5,6}
3		
4	1.	University Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head & Neck surgery, Antwerp
5		University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium
6	2.	Department of Translational Neurosciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences,
7		Antwerp University, Wilrijk, Belgium
8	3.	Department of Education, Health & Social Work, University College Ghent, Ghent, Belgium
9	4.	College of Nursing and Health Sciences, Flinders University, Bedford Park, SA, Australia
10	5.	Tinnitus Research Initiative, Regensburg, Germany
11	6.	Ear Institute, University College London, UK
12		
13	All	correspondence should be addressed to:
14	Pro	of. dr. Raj Shekhawat
15	Flir	nders Medical Centre GPO Box 2100, Adelaide 5001, South Australia
16	gir	iraj.shekhawat@flinders.edu.au / +61 8 72218918

- 17 Financial disclosures/conflicts of interest:
- 18 There are no conflicts of interest, financial, or otherwise.

19 Abstract

20 Background

Tinnitus, the perception of a sound in absence of an external auditory source, can significantly impact ones' quality of life. As tinnitus is often associated with hearing loss, hearing aids have been proposed for tinnitus relief in literature for more than 70 years. While there is a long history of clinical work and research on this topic, there is a need for recent literature to be reviewed and guide decision making in tinnitus management.

26 <u>Objective</u>

The aim of this scoping review is to provide an update of the available evidence on hearing aids for tinnitus, focusing on the effect of sound amplification, to draw conclusions for clinical practice and identify gaps in the field. A consultation exercise was included to discuss current issues that practitioners and carers themselves face but remain under-researched.

31 <u>Design</u>

32 This scoping review was conducted based on the six-stage framework of Arksey et al. (2005).

33 Studies were included if they investigated hearing aids for tinnitus and were published after 2011.

34 Databases of PubMed and Scopus were explored on the 16th of November 2020. The search was

35 limited to English manuscripts. A total of 28 primary research studies were selected.

36 <u>Results</u>

Positive results of hearing aids for tinnitus relief were shown by 68 % of the studies, whereas 14 % demonstrated no change in tinnitus perception. As the quality of the evidence across studies was variable, no consensus can be reached regarding the use of hearing aids as a treatment for tinnitus. Nevertheless, recent studies were more likely to focus on optimizing the effect of hearing aids and better predicting which tinnitus patients benefit from hearing aids. The experts

- 42 stated that the findings were in agreement with their view on the scientific evidence and they
- 43 emphasized the importance of reaching consensus.
- 44 <u>Conclusions</u>
- 45 The majority of the studies supported the use of hearing aids for tinnitus relief. Hence, there was
- 46 some scientific support for it, but the quality of evidence was questioned. Stronger methodology
- 47 in future studies is needed to reach consensus and support clinical guidelines development.

48

49 Key words: hearing aids, sound amplification, tinnitus, scoping review, treatment

50 Introduction

51 Tinnitus is the perception of a sound (e.g. sizzling, ringing or hissing) in the absence of a 52 corresponding acoustic source (Baguley et al. 2013; Jastreboff 1990). It is a common experience (10-15% in adults) which, for some (2.4% in adults), may cause a considerable amount of distress 53 54 and decreased quality of life (Axelsson et al. 1989; Baguley et al. 2013). As tinnitus has no cure 55 and is generally associated with hearing loss, hearing aids have been proposed for tinnitus relief 56 for more than 70 years (Saltzman et al. 1947). In 2013, Shekhawat et al. conducted a scoping 57 review to explore the role of hearing aids in tinnitus management (Shekhawat, Searchfield and 58 Stinear 2013). The authors concluded that some evidence had been provided for the use of 59 hearing aids. However, the authors identified a need for stronger methodology and randomized 60 control trials.

61 The exact working mechanism behind tinnitus relief with hearing aids is not yet fully understood. 62 Proposed mediation factors include reduction in central gain, habituation, reduction in 63 communication stress, altered neuronal plasticity and masking (Beck 2011; Robert W. Sweetow et 64 al. 2010). The maladaptive neuronal gain in the central auditory system as a response to the 65 cochlear deafferentation (i.e. central gain) might be reduced as hearing aids provide additional 66 sensory input which was lost (Noreña 2011). This repaired input can also lead to increased 67 neuronal activity in the auditory pathway, possibly interfering with the central processing of 68 tinnitus (Jastreboff et al. 1993). As such, the contrast between tinnitus and background stimuli 69 can be reduced, facilitating habituation to tinnitus. Decreased communication stress, on the other 70 hand, as a result of hearing aids use, can support coping with tinnitus (Surr et al. 1985). A long 71 term effect of hearing aids that has been proposed through animal studies is reversing the tinnitus-related cortical reorganization (Eggermont 2008). Finally, the model of masking suggests 72 73 that hearing aids can (partially) mask the tinnitus percept and, thus, divert attention away from it 74 to more meaningful sounds (Coles et al. 1987).

75 Masking can also be achieved by providing additional, more acceptable stimuli with a sound 76 generator. This concept was introduced in 1976 by Vernon et al. (J. Vernon et al. 1976). Beyond 77 masking, the potential positive effect of sound generators for tinnitus might be due to a sense of 78 relief, habituation, neuromodulation or relaxation (Jastreboff and Hazell 1993; Noreña et al. 2005; 79 R. W. Sweetow et al. 2010; Tass et al. 2012; J. A. Vernon et al. 2003). However, as sound therapy 80 is often part of a more extensive tinnitus management program, such as Tinnitus Retraining 81 Therapy (Jastreboff et al. 2000) or bimodal therapy (Luyten & Jacquemin et al. 2020), it has been 82 difficult to draw conclusions concerning its isolated effectiveness (Sereda et al. 2018). The two 83 approaches of amplification and sound generation can be incorporated in combination devices.

Previous reviews investigating the effect of sound-enriching devices (i.e. hearing aids, sound generators, combination devices) reached similar conclusions: positive results have been demonstrated in terms of tinnitus relief, however the quality of evidence is low (Hoare et al. 2014; Hobson et al. 2012; Sereda et al. 2018; Tutaj et al. 2018). Hence, it seems that from 2012 until 2018, no considerable improvement has been made in this field, and as such, conclusive evidence is absent.

90 The current scoping review provides an overview of all available evidence on hearing aids for 91 tinnitus published after the scoping review by Shekhawat et al. in 2013, focusing mainly on the 92 effect of sound amplification itself. Over the last years, considerable amount of research has been 93 conducted in this field. As such, this scoping review might lead to new insights. A last, but 94 essential, stage of a scoping review will be included (and was missing in Shekhawat's review), 95 namely a consultation exercise which discusses current issues that practitioners and carers 96 themselves face but remain under-researched. Finally, this type of review will make it possible to 97 draw conclusions for clinical practice and identify gaps in the field from the data of different 98 types of studies (e.g. randomized controlled trials (RCTs), retrospective studies, clinical gathered

99 data), thus without excluding studies based on their quality (Arksey and O'Malley 2005; Mays et100 al. 2001).

101 Methods

102 A scoping review was conducted according to the framework of Arksey and O'Malley (2005). In 103 order to collect all relevant primary research studies published on this topic since 2011, an 104 advanced search was carried out using the databases of PubMed and Scopus on the 16th of 105 November 2020, limited to English manuscripts. The title and/or abstract had to include the key 106 words 'tinnitus' and 'hearing aid'. In figure 1, the details of the search strategy are presented.

107 <u>Results</u>

108 The key elements of the 28 selected primary research studies are shown in chronological order in 109 Table 1. The studies are extensively discussed in the current section. First, the studies focusing on 110 the primary effect of sound amplification through a hearing aid are described, after which the 111 studies investigating the additional effect of sound masking are presented.

112 <u>Hearing Aids</u>

113 A total of 16 articles focused on fitting of hearing aids in a tinnitus population.

114 Benefits of hearing aid use

115 The additional benefit for hearing aid users with tinnitus compared to hearing aid users without 116 tinnitus was the topic of three studies included in this scoping review. Andersson et al. (2011) 117 described retrospectively the benefits of hearing aid use in 52 tinnitus patients and 33 non-118 tinnitus patients. The tinnitus group reported more aversiveness and less benefit in difficult 119 situations with a hearing aid. As the results were mainly from patients with a low tinnitus distress, 120 extrapolation to the tinnitus population needs caution. In addition, the low response rate (53%) 121 might have biased the results. Furthermore, a comparison between tinnitus (n=12) and non-122 tinnitus patients (n=12) after hearing aid use was made by Araujo et al. (2016) in an elderly

123 population. The psychoacoustic measures of tinnitus, as well as the self-report questionnaires 124 were assessed after 1 and 3 months of hearing aid use. The tinnitus loudness reduced 125 significantly over time, as well as the nuisance with tinnitus and hearing loss. Moreover, all 126 participants were satisfied with the use of hearing aids. However, tinnitus counselling was also 127 provided during this study. Remarkably, all tinnitus patients were female. This potential gender 128 bias might have influenced the results as it has been suggested that male and female patients 129 respond differently to tinnitus treatments (Van der Wal et al. 2020). The most recent study on 130 this topic was done by Zarenoe et al. (2017), who compared the effect of hearing aids on working 131 memory, sleep and hearing problems. Their sample consisted of 46 tinnitus patients and 46 non-132 tinnitus patients who were followed-up until 3 months after completion of fitting in a prospective 133 study. The tinnitus group showed a significantly larger improvement in terms of working memory 134 (measured by the Reading Span) and self-reported sleep difficulties. Moreover, significant 135 improvements in tinnitus distress were shown. While Araujo and Iório (2016) and Zarenoe et al. 136 (2017) suggest a positive effect of hearing aid use on tinnitus, Andersson et al. (2011) call 137 attention to the fact that hearing aid fitting might be more difficult in a tinnitus population due to 138 aversiveness of sound. Moreover, the demonstrated positive effects on tinnitus can be mediated 139 by the decrease in nuisance with hearing loss, improved sleep quality and improved cognitive 140 function.

141 The secondary benefits in hearing-aid users who experience tinnitus were further investigated by 142 Cabral et al. (2016) and Yokota et al. (2020). Cabral et al. (2016) showed significant changes in 143 emotional and auditory complaints after three months of hearing aid use in 17 patients, however 144 different questionnaires were applied before and after hearing aid use, which impedes 145 interpretations of these results. The retrospective study by Yokota et al. (2020) evaluated changes 146 in tinnitus distress before and 12 months after hearing-aid use in 66 patients with a primary 147 complaint of hearing disturbance and co-existing tinnitus. Significant improvements were salient, 148 even in patients with bilateral tinnitus who were fitted with a unilateral hearing aid. But for

patients with unilateral tinnitus, there was no significant improvement in case the hearing aid was
worn on the contralateral side. These two studies show that tinnitus relief can be apparent, even
if that was not the primary motivation for the hearing aid use.

152 Fitting adjustments for tinnitus relief

153 The effect of notch filter amplification was evaluated in three studies, all comparing this 154 approach to conventional amplification. Two of the three studies did not report significant 155 effects of either treatment on tinnitus perception. Strauss et al. (2015) included 20 patients with 156 tonal tinnitus in a 3 weeks double-blind study. While more prominent improvement was shown 157 for the notch-induced lateral inhibition, the authors did not report whether this result was 158 significant. A more recent study by Marcrum et al. (2020) conducted a comparable study with 39 159 adults with a primary complaint of tonal tinnitus over a period of 12 weeks. The authors reported 160 a minimal effect of either treatment on tinnitus symptoms. However, there was no significant 161 difference between notch filter and conventional amplification (23.8% and 33.3% meaningful 162 benefit according to Tinnitus Handicap Inventory; THI). Yet, the group of Strauss recently 163 conducted a second study with notched hearing aids and were able to show significant 164 improvements (Haab et al. 2019). The goal was to evaluate this treatment on the long-term (i.e. 6 165 months) with a control group being fitted with standard hearing aids. The group with notched 166 hearing aids improved significantly in their Tinnitus Questionnaire (TQ) in comparison to the 167 patients in the control group. In sum, notched acoustic stimulation was successfully integrated 168 into patient's daily routine and might be promising. However, further studies are required to 169 replicate these recent results. It has to be noted that a precise and robust characterization of the 170 patients' tinnitus frequency and its' possible fluctuations over time is crucial for therapeutic 171 success.

As tinnitus is often associated with a descending-slope type of hearing loss (i.e. the mostcommon type of hearing loss), signal processing strategies improving the audibility of high-

174 frequency sounds have been evaluated in a tinnitus population. The retrospective study of Peltier 175 et al. (2012) described the effect of Linear Frequency Transposition (LFT) in terms of tinnitus 176 suppression for 74 patients. A total of 81% reported tinnitus suppression. However, it was not 177 reported whether this suppression was significant. There were also no fixed time points for data 178 collection, neither clear inclusion nor exclusion criteria. The effect of another frequency lowering 179 technique, namely Frequency Compression (FC), was evaluated and compared to the 180 conventional Wide Dynamic Range Compression (WDRC) in a crossover trial by Hodgson et al. 181 (2015). While both treatments resulted in tinnitus improvements, WDRC showed larger 182 improvements. It is important to note that every patient also received one counselling session. 183 More recently, Frequency Translation (FT), LFT and WDRC were compared in a randomized 184 double-blind controlled trial by Yakunina et al. (2019). A total of 94 tinnitus patients were 185 randomized into the three groups and wore the hearing aid for three months, followed by a 186 period of cessation for 3 months. The tinnitus perception improved for the groups post-187 intervention and at 3 months follow-up. However, no difference between the groups was found. 188 Furthermore, the authors stated that the effect lasted for 3 months after stopping hearing aid use, 189 but no analyses were conducted to compare the tinnitus perception at post intervention and 190 follow up. While these three studies reported positive effects of frequency lowering techniques to 191 some extent, no superiority over conventional amplification could be demonstrated.

192 Shekhawat et al. (2013) and Shetty and Pottackal (2019) focused on the fitting parameters 193 preferred by patients for tinnitus relief. The study by Shekhawat et al. aimed to identify the 194 optimized high frequency amplification for a first-fit. A total of 25 chronic tinnitus patients were 195 asked to compare 13 speech files (i.e. simulating effects of a change in DSL i/o v5 prescription) 196 in terms of their tinnitus perception. Overall, a reduction in output was most preferred. More 197 specifically, A 6 dB reduction to the prescribed gain at 2 kHz was most preferred. There was a 198 trend observed in which lower tinnitus pitch was associated with a preference for reduction in 199 gain, but it failed to reach statistical significance. These findings may be limited as it was a lab

200 experiment, and as such no follow up data on the effect of these prescriptions in daily life were 201 available. More recently, the gain needed for tinnitus suppression was investigated in a more 202 extensive study design which was applied by Shetty & Pottackal (2019). The effect on tinnitus 203 perception and speech understanding in noise (SPIN) was evaluated up to 30 days of hearing aid 204 use. Their sample consisted of a very specific group, namely 20 patients who experience 205 catastrophic tinnitus (i.e. always heard, disturbed sleep pattern and difficulty with any activity) 206 even after being fitted with a hearing aid. A comparison between the fitting formula DSL i/o v5 207 and NAL-NL2 showed that higher gain at the tinnitus pitch was needed for the latter formula in 208 terms of tinnitus suppression. Interestingly, SPIN was not affected by tinnitus pitch or revised 209 fitting formula. Moreover, these authors also found that a lower tinnitus pitch was associated 210 with less gain needed, which is in agreement with the results by Shekhawat et al. (2013), and this 211 association was significant. Also, in this study the gain adjustments were performed in the lab. 212 Hence, authors of both studies recommended adjusting the gain at the tinnitus pitch using DSL 213 (I/o) v5 for tinnitus management.

214 Predictive factors for hearing aid use resulting in tinnitus relief

215 McNeill et al. (2012) evaluated retrospectively predictive factors for tinnitus relief in 70 patients 216 with bothersome chronic tinnitus. The reduction in tinnitus complaints was significantly larger 217 when participants achieved masking (i.e. hearing tinnitus softer or not at all), and masking was 218 more likely in patients with good low-frequency hearing and a tinnitus pitch in the frequency 219 range of the hearing aids. It is important to bear in mind that the 'no masking' group also had a 220 lower tinnitus severity prior to the study. Clinical trials focusing on predictive factors for 221 therapeutic success with hearing aids are warranted, as the tinnitus population is highly 222 heterogeneous (Cederroth et al. 2019).

223 Enhancement of sound therapy from hearing aids

224 Whether a combination of two existing treatments for tinnitus lead to a larger benefit was 225 investigated by Shekhawat et al. (2014) by applying multisession transcranial direct current 226 stimulation (tDCS) on five consecutive days before hearing-aid use. A total of 40 chronic tinnitus 227 patients were enrolled in this 7-month during double-blind randomized clinical trial. The patients 228 were randomized in two groups: sham vs. experimental tDCS. As the results showed a significant 229 similar reduction in tinnitus severity for both groups, the hearing aid effects appeared 230 independent of tDCS. Only one parameter changed after experimental tDCS, namely minimum 231 masking levels. However, as hearing aids were fitted immediately following the tDCS sequence 232 and the hearing aids had a strong effect, any tDCS effect might have been washed out by larger 233 effects of sound amplification. It was recommended more recently to have a washout period of a 234 few days between the stimulation sessions because the impact of multiple tDCS sessions on 235 tinnitus being non-linear in nature (Shekhawat et al. 2018). Zarenoe et al. (2016) looked also into 236 the optimization of hearing aids for tinnitus relief by adding motivational interviewing (MI) to 237 their protocol. This pilot RCT included 50 patients with tinnitus and sensorineural hearing loss, 238 but four patients dropped out due to dissatisfaction of hearing aid amplification. Hence, 23 239 patients received a brief MI program as an adjunct to hearing aid rehabilitation, whereas the other 240 patients underwent conventional hearing aid fitting. The authors succeeded in their aim as a 241 significant larger improvement was demonstrated for the first group 3 months after completing 242 hearing aid fitting. While these results were positive, they might have been biased by differences 243 in hearing thresholds and tinnitus distress at baseline between both groups. It was not clear if 244 these differences were significant. These preliminary, but promising results, should be replicated 245 in larger trials.

246 Overview of results with amplification

In summary, out of the 16 studies described above, nine studies showed significant
improvements in tinnitus perception (Araujo and Iório 2016; Cabral et al. 2016; Haab et al. 2019;

249	Hodgson et al. 2015; Shekhawat et al. 2014; Yakunina et al. 2019; Yokota et al. 2020; Zarenoe et
250	al. 2017; Zarenoe et al. 2016), while four studies did not report significant tinnitus relief
251	(Marcrum et al. 2020; McNeill et al. 2012; Peltier et al. 2012; Strauss et al. 2015). The other three
252	studies did not test whether hearing aids' use leads to tinnitus relief (Andersson et al. 2011;
253	Shekhawat, Searchfield, Kobayashi, et al. 2013; Shetty and Pottackal 2019).
254	

255

256 Additional masking in hearing aids

257 A total of 12 articles focused on adding an additional masking function to the hearing aids in a258 tinnitus population.

259 Evaluation of combination devices

260 Additional benefit of sound generators in a hearing aid

261 A total of 3 studies focused on the effect of combination devices (i.e. amplification and sound 262 generator) compared to conventional amplification. In 2014, dos Santos et al. investigated if 263 combination devices (HA + SG) were more effective than conventional amplification alone (HA) 264 (dos Santos et al. 2014). The study design was a blind randomized clinical trial that included 49 265 chronic tinnitus patients with a bilateral mild to moderate SNHL. The authors specified that the 266 white noise in the sound generator was set at the lowest intensity capable of providing tinnitus 267 relief and that the noise reduction strategies were switched off. Both groups showed significant 268 improvements after 3 months of hearing aid use. Yet, there was no statistically significant 269 difference between both groups. More specifically, 62.5 % of the first group (HA + SG) and 78 270 % of the second group (HA) showed a clinically significant reduction in tinnitus annoyance (i.e. a 271 minimal reduction of 20 points on the THI). Notably, all participants used the same hearing aids, 272 which were developed by the University of São Paulo. One year later, a study was published by

273 Henry et al. (2015), in which a commercially available combination hearing aid (with an 274 amplitude and frequency modulated noise stimulus) was evaluated in a study funded by Starkey 275 Hearing Technologies. The 30 participants with bothersome tinnitus were hearing aid candidates 276 who did not wear hearing aids in the previous 12 months. Similar to the previous study, both 277 groups demonstrated significant improvements in terms of tinnitus distress, without a significant 278 difference between groups. However, this study showed a trend that prioritized combination 279 devices. Interestingly, the participants also filled out the self-report questionnaires for the 280 situations in which they were not wearing the hearing aids. The results showed also significant 281 improvements for those moments. Moreover, the sound generators did not result in any negative 282 effect on hearing handicap. Similar results were found by Henry et al. (2017), who replicated this 283 study, although the devices used were from a different manufacturer (i.e. Phonak, with three SG 284 options: white noise, pink noise and spectrally shaped noise) and a third comparison option was 285 added (i.e. extended-wear, deep fit hearing aids; EWHA - worn 24h/day, 7d/week). The 286 inclusion of EWHAs was based on observations that many patients using this type of hearing aid 287 perceived their tinnitus as less bothersome. This RCT included 55 patients with a mild to 288 moderately-severe hearing loss and bothersome tinnitus. Moreover, hearing-specific 289 questionnaires and a speech-in-noise test showed similar improvements in the three groups. 290 Although not significant, the tinnitus relief was smaller for the HA only group and the hearing 291 improvement was smaller for the EWHA group. In sum, a superiority of combination devices 292 compared to conventional hearing aids has not been proven. On the other hand, there is also no 293 inferiority of combination devices in terms of speech understanding demonstrated in these 294 papers.

The effectiveness of a combination device (HA + SG) for 15 patients with a hearing loss was compared to a sound generator only (SG) for 15 normal hearing patients (NH) in a study by Rocha et al. (2017). All patients had bilateral chronic tinnitus, used the same hearing aid with a constant white noise and participated in a counselling session. This approach was successful as

both groups revealed significant improvements at six months follow-up. The authors concluded
that the use of a sound generator was similarly effective for NH patients as a combination device
for patients with a hearing loss. However, the results might be yet again mediated by the effect of
counselling.

303 The satisfactory rates of SG, HA or SG + HA were investigated in a longitudinal study 304 specifically focusing on war veterans with blast-induced chronic tinnitus (Jalilvand et al. 2015). 305 More specifically, 974 patients were provided with a sound generator and a hearing aid at baseline 306 and were followed up for two years. The satisfaction scores for HA and HA + SG increased with 307 time, while the scores decreased for SG. This could be explained by patients tolerating the 308 amplification better over time, resulting in more amplification and higher satisfaction rates. On 309 the other hand, the sound generator gradually became unpleasant for the patients, according to 310 the authors. Most patients reported to prefer a hearing aid only (HA: 84 %, HA + SG: 13.3 %, 311 SG: 2.7 %). It is important to note that in the early years of this study (2004), hearing aids and 312 sound generators were fitted as separate devices. As such, the number of subjects who preferred 313 both in those times was very small. The authors did not find explaining variables such as 314 audiological parameters or tinnitus characteristics.

315 While most studies include a control group who receive conventional amplification, sound 316 generator, counselling or no therapy at all, Oz et al. (2013) administered betahistine to 21 patients 317 with a primary complaint of chronic tinnitus in an RCT. A total of 12 patients received in 318 addition a combination device or a sound generator (both with a wideband noise), depending on 319 the hearing loss. Both groups showed positive effects on tinnitus after 3 months. It has to be 320 noted that this study claims to be double blinded, but it is unclear how they blinded patients for 321 using a hearing aid. Moreover, a recent Cochrane review shows that there is no evidence to 322 suggest that betahistine has an effect on subjective idiopathic tinnitus (Wegner et al. 2018).

323 Benefit in terms of hearing and tinnitus

324 Two studies included in this scoping review did not include a control group in the evaluation of 325 combination devices. Berberian et al. (2017) evaluated bilateral use of combination devices for 6 326 months in 25 patients with bilateral tinnitus and mild to moderately severe hearing loss. They 327 showed significant improvements in hearing thresholds and tinnitus perception. Similarly, Rocha 328 & Mondelli (2020) evaluated the benefit of combination devices (with white noise) over 6 329 months. A total of 40 chronic bilateral tinnitus patients with symmetrical bilateral mild to 330 moderate SNHL were included. Real ear measurements (REM) were performed to verify the 331 sound generator. Significant tinnitus improvements were shown. Hence, these two studies are in 332 agreement with previously described studies as they show positive effects of combination devices 333 but could not contribute to the discussion whether additional masking is beneficiary.

334 Sound generator, masking, .. What's in a name?

335 While many studies focus on the effect of sound generators and combination devices, some 336 studies focused more on the ideal sound stimulus to provide tinnitus relief. Searchfield et al. 337 (2016) investigated thoroughly masking at the perceived spatial location of the patient's tinnitus 338 (i.e. 3D masking). Their paper describes three studies: a proof-of-concept study, a prototype 339 evaluation, and a four-month crossover pilot study. A preference for the 3D masking stimulus 340 and less preference for unilateral masking was shown. Moreover, the 3D masking did not have to 341 be as loud as other maskers. Finally, the prototype evaluation demonstrated significant larger 342 tinnitus improvements with the 3D masking.

A sound therapy introduced by Widex is called Zen Tones, which uses music that is generated based on a fractal algorithm. Adjustments can be made in terms of volume, pitch, and tempo. Moreover, automatic adjustments are made based on the ambient noise in the environment. A pilot study with the Widex Zen Tinnitus Therapy was performed in 2017 by Tyler at al., evaluating the progression of benefits in 20 chronic tinnitus patients receiving counselling, hearing aids, tinnitus activities and Zen therapy. They demonstrated that all participants

349 significantly benefited from this approach. Large benefits were observed following the last two 350 elements of the treatment. It is important to bear in mind that seven patients were already 351 hearing aid users, and that not all patients needed the same amount and type of appointments. 352 An evaluation of the additional benefit of Zen tones was conducted by Shabana et al. (2018) with 353 40 chronic tinnitus patients with a SNHL. Also, in this study the patients followed first 2 months 354 of counselling before using hearing aids for 4 months. Zen tones were made available for 20 355 participants (i.e. study group). Significant improvements were only demonstrated after 356 counselling and amplification. Yet, a significantly greater benefit was apparent for the study 357 group. It has to be noted that all patients were fitted monaurally for financial reasons.

358 A pre-market version of Oticon Alta with a tinnitus sound generator was evaluated in a feasibility 359 study of Sereda et al. (2017). The eight participants, who were experienced and satisfied hearing 360 aid users with chronic tinnitus, could select different types of noise (i.e. white/pink/brown, 361 unmodulated or modulated, non-filtered or bandpassed) and three different ocean sounds. 362 Participants reported to be satisfied with the feeling of control and the variations possible. As can 363 be expected, preferences depended on the individual and the situation. Yet, participants reported 364 that the broadband noise was the most effective masker and the ocean noises were more 365 distracting and/or relaxing. In general, combination devices were equally preferred over the 366 conventional amplification.

367 Overview of results with additional masking

368 Tinnitus complaints significantly decreased in ten studies (Berberian et al. 2017; dos Santos et al.
369 2014; Henry et al. 2015; Henry et al. 2017; Oz et al. 2013; Rocha and Mondelli 2017, 2020;
370 Searchfield et al. 2016; Shabana et al. 2018; Tyler et al. 2017). Two studies did not conduct
371 analyses to investigate if hearing aid use and/or the masking function result into tinnitus relief
372 (Jalilvand et al. 2015; Sereda et al. 2017).

373 Discussion

374 In view of all that has been mentioned so far, one may suppose that hearing aid use improves 375 tinnitus perception. However, the quality of evidence could be questioned. Nevertheless, recent 376 studies were more likely to focus on (1) optimizing the effect of hearing aids, by investigating 377 different forms of amplification, and (2) better predicting which tinnitus patients benefit from 378 hearing aids.

379 When optimizing tinnitus relief through hearing aid use, it is important to bear in mind that 380 hearing aid fitting for chronic tinnitus patients can be challenging, as they require different fitting 381 strategies. These patients might show increased aversiveness and decreased benefit in difficult 382 listening situations with a hearing aid (Andersson et al. 2011). Decreased gain might be needed, 383 specifically with patients who experience a lower tinnitus pitch. More advanced strategies, such as 384 notch filter amplification and frequency lowering, demonstrate promising results, though the 385 added benefits are still debated. Similarly, the addition of sound generators in a combination 386 device has resulted in tinnitus improvement without a clear added benefit compared to 387 conventional amplification. Jalilvand et al. in 2015 stated that amplification might be better 388 tolerated over time, while sound generators might gradually become unpleasant (Jalilvand et al. 389 2015). The ideal noise settings probably depend on the individual patient and the situation. 390 Furthermore, while there is a general preference for the use of binaural hearing aids in tinnitus 391 patients, monaural hearing aids have also provided positive results, calling attention to cost-392 efficiency (Shabana et al. 2018; Yokota et al. 2020).

Predicting those who can most benefit from hearing aids in terms of tinnitus experience remains a challenge. Mc Neill et al. in 2012 found that patients with good low-frequency hearing and a tinnitus pitch in the frequency range of the hearing aids might perceive a larger tinnitus improvement (McNeill et al. 2012). It is clear that, as most studies apply different amplification protocols and reach significant improvements, more research is needed to uncover what works for whom.

399 The use of digital noise reduction and adaptive directional microphone systems has also been 400 discussed in some studies, as they might reduce the potential impact of hearing aid use on 401 tinnitus severity. The idea behind switching these digital features off is that continuous exposure 402 to ambient noise levels may lead to reduction of gain in the auditory pathway. However, these 403 features might be needed for beneficial effects in terms of hearing (dos Santos et al. 2014; 404 Marcrum et al. 2020; McNeill et al. 2012; Shekhawat, Searchfield, Kobayashi, et al. 2013; Shetty 405 and Pottackal 2019). Unfortunately, this topic was not further investigated since 2011 to our 406 knowledge.

407 Another ongoing debate concerns the degree of tinnitus complaints when the hearing aid is 408 switched off (for a few hours or even longer). While this topic was also not specifically 409 investigated in the retrieved studies, some authors have discussed the matter. Most of them 410 reported smaller positive results without the hearing aid device (Araujo and Iório 2016; Henry et 411 al. 2015). Nevertheless, Yakunina et al. (2019) reported that the tinnitus improvements lasted for 412 at least 3 months after 3 months of hearing aid use. Hence, these authors suggest that the 413 mechanism of tinnitus suppression is beyond temporary masking and distraction. Another 414 possible explanation is the effect of counseling, which was often part of the treatment in the 415 reported studies, and this effect is not dependent on wearing the hearing aid or not. While for 416 research purposes including counseling influences the results, in clinical practice it is often part of 417 the multidisciplinary approach.

The findings of the current scoping review may be somewhat limited by the quality of the presented studies. First, some studies did not investigate the standalone effect of hearing aids, as they provided other treatments during the study (e.g. counselling) and/or did not include a control group. Moreover, some studies analyzed clinical gathered data, without a prospective fixed protocol, which impedes the formation of strong conclusions.

423 Consultation exercise

424 Practitioners and patients' view on the current topic are a final, but valuable, stage of the current 425 scoping review. In a Delphi review of 2015, including 19 UK hearing professionals, Sereda and 426 colleagues found that the presence of bothersome tinnitus supported the choice for hearing aids 427 in patients with hearing difficulties and realistic expectations of this technology. Moreover, 'open-428 fit technology' and 'bilateral fitting' were part of the usual care for bothersome tinnitus. However, 429 the authors stated that a clear link between diagnostic information and recommended treatment 430 was lacking, as well as specific guidelines and recommended questionnaires (Sereda et al. 2015). 431 For the current study, seven experts in the field (i.e. 3 audiology researchers, 1 clinical audiologist 432 with expertise in hearing aid fitting for tinnitus, 1 tinnitus consultant and 2 representatives of a 433 patient association) were consulted about the study findings. In general, the findings were in 434 agreement with their view on the scientific evidence of hearing aids for tinnitus and they also 435 emphasized the importance for RCTs in order to reach consensus. The input of the experts is 436 summarized in the following points:

437 1) The high variability in effects on tinnitus perception is similar to the experiences in 438 clinical practice, especially at first. Fitting and adjusting seems to take longer in this 439 population. It is important to further explore which patients can benefit from hearing aid 440 fitting (e.g. role of age, tinnitus pitch, personality, distress, sleeping problems, coping, 441 motivation, expectations) and what 'motivational interviewing' can contribute to this 442 issue. Moreover, several questions remain on the fitting method itself (e.g. importance of 443 comfort, sound quality, REM). Consequently, this could support development of 444 guidelines for clinicians, as well as for patient associations.

2) The use of sound generators is often temporarily and in combination with
psychoeducation. Patients often report the relaxation effect of these additional sounds.
Hence, the question arises which sound stimuli should be used (e.g. music, nature sounds,
pure stimuli, etc). With regards to combination devices, datalogging is needed to uncover

19

how long patients use different programs and in which situations. As patients often
report an aggravation of tinnitus after switching the masking off, the risk of sound
generators interfering with the habituation process came up in this consultation phase
and should be the topic of future research.

453

- 454 3) As counseling is often an essential part of a multidisciplinary approach, the experts
 455 recommended future studies to focus on the content and the extent of the counseling
 456 needed in a hearing aid fitting. Excluding counseling might lead to counterproductive
 457 effects in their opinion.
- 458 4) More attention should be given to the different hearing losses (e.g. type and degree of
 459 hearing loss) and the effects of different hearing solutions needed, as well as the
 460 relationship between the change in audibility/listening effort and the change in tinnitus
 461 perception.

462 <u>Conclusions</u>

463 As there is a long history of clinical work and research on hearing aids for tinnitus relief, there 464 was a need for recent literature to be reviewed and guide decision making in tinnitus 465 management. Moreover, a consultation exercise, which is an essential stage of a scoping review, 466 was included. The majority of the studies supported the use of hearing aids for tinnitus relief, 467 however, the quality of evidence is low, limiting the confidence in the scientific support. The 468 experts stated that the findings were in agreement with their view on the scientific evidence and 469 they emphasized the importance of reaching consensus. While a stronger methodology is 470 recommended, future studies should determine the optimal hearing solution for sound 471 amplification and sound generation in tinnitus patients. More attention needs to be brought on 472 how it should be fitted and the ideal parameters, as well as on how this can be part of a larger 473 multidisciplinary approach. Finally, the underlying working mechanisms must be further

- 474 explored, more specifically in order to understand the effect of switching off the hearing aid at
- 475 night and the predictive factors for therapy success.

476

477 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- 478 We gratefully acknowledge the valuable input of the experts of the consultation stage,
- 479 Prof. dr. David Baguley, drs. Rene van der Wilk, Nancy Van Looveren, Prof. dr. Vinaya
- 480 Manchaiah, Prof. dr. Annick Gilles, Bert Lecomte and Wout De Coster.

481 <u>References</u>

- Andersson, G., Keshishi, A., Baguley, D. M. (2011). Benefit from hearing aids in users with and
 without tinnitus. *Audiological Medicine*, *9*, 73-78.
- 484 Araujo, T. d. M., Iório, M. C. M. (2016). Effects of sound amplification in self-perception of tinnitus
 485 and hearing loss in the elderly. *Brazilian Journal of Otorhinolaryngology, 82*, 289-296.
- 486 Arksey, H., O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International* 487 *Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *8*, 19-32.
- Axelsson, A., Ringdahl, A. (1989). Tinnitus—a study of its prevalence and characteristics. *British Journal of Audiology*, 23, 53-62.
- 490 Baguley, D., McFerran, D., Hall, D. (2013). Tinnitus. *Lancet, 382*, 1600-1607.
- 491 Beck, D. L. (2011). Hearing aid amplification and tinnitus: 2011 overview. 64, 12-14.
- Berberian, A. P., Ribas, A., Imlau, D., et al. (2017). Benefit of Using the Prosthesis with Sound
 Generators in Individuals with Tinnitus Associated With Mild to Moderately Severe Hearing
 Loss. Int Tinnitus J, 20, 64-68.
- Cabral, J., Tonocchi, R., Ribas, Â., et al. (2016). The efficacy of hearing aids for emotional and auditory
 tinnitus issues. Int Tinnitus J, 20, 54-58.
- Cederroth, C. R., Gallus, S., Hall, D. A., et al. (2019). Editorial: Towards an Understanding of Tinnitus
 Heterogeneity. *Front Aging Neurosci*, *11*, 53.
- 499 Coles, R. R. A., Hallam, R. S. (1987). Tinnitus and its management. *British Medical Bulletin, 43*, 983-500 998.
- dos Santos, G. M., Bento, R. F., de Medeiros, I. R., et al. (2014). The influence of sound generator
 associated with conventional amplification for tinnitus control: randomized blind clinical trial.
 Trends Hear, 18.
- Eggermont, J. J. (2008). The role of sound in adult and developmental auditory cortical plasticity. *Ear Hear, 29,* 819-829.
- Haab, L., Lehser, C., Corona-Strauss, F. I., et al. (2019). Implementation and Long-Term Evaluation of
 a Hearing Aid Supported Tinnitus Treatment Using Notched Environmental Sounds. *IEEE J Transl Eng Health Med*, 7, 1600109.
- Henry, J. A., Frederick, M., Sell, S., et al. (2015). Validation of a Novel Combination Hearing Aid and
 Tinnitus Therapy Device. *Ear and Hearing*, *36*.
- Henry, J. A., McMillan, G., Dann, S., et al. (2017). Tinnitus Management: Randomized Controlled Trial
 Comparing Extended-Wear Hearing Aids, Conventional Hearing Aids, and Combination
 Instruments. J Am Acad Audiol, 28, 546-561.
- Hoare, D. J., Edmondson-Jones, M., Sereda, M., et al. (2014). Amplification with hearing aids for
 patients with tinnitus and co-existing hearing loss. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, Cd010151.

516	Hobson, J., Chisholm, E., El Refaie, A. (2012). Sound therapy (masking) in the management of tinnitus
517	in adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 11, Cd006371.
518	Hodgson, S. A., Herdering, R., Singh Shekhawat, G., et al. (2015). A crossover trial comparing wide
519	dynamic range compression and frequency compression in hearing aids for tinnitus therapy.
520	Disabil Renabil Assist Technol, 12, 97-103.
521	Jacquemin, L., Luyten, T. R., Van Looveren, N., et al. (2020). Bimodal Therapy for Chronic Subjective
522	Innitus: A Randomized Controlled Irial of EMDR and IRT Versus CBT and IRT. 11.
523	Jalilvand, H., Pourbakht, A., Haghani, H. (2015). Hearing aid or tinnitus masker: which one is the best
524	treatment for blast-induced tinnitus? The results of a long-term study on 974 patients. Audiol
525	Neurootol, 20, 195-201.
526	Jastreboff, P. J. (1990). Phantom auditory perception (tinnitus): mechanisms of generation and
527	perception. <i>Neurosci Res, 8,</i> 221-254.
528	Jastreboff, P. J., Hazell, J. W. (1993). A neurophysiological approach to tinnitus: clinical implications.
529	Br J Audiol, 27, 7-17.
530	Jastreboff, P. J., Jastreboff, M. M. (2000). Tinnitus Retraining Therapy (TRT) as a method for
531	treatment of tinnitus and hyperacusis patients. J Am Acad Audiol, 11, 162-177.
532	Marcrum, S. C., Picou, E. M., Steffens, T., et al. (2020). Conventional versus notch filter amplification
533	for the treatment of tinnitus in adults with mild-to-moderate hearing loss. In Progress in
534	Brain Research: Elsevier.
535	Mays, N., Roberts, E., Popay, J. (2001). Synthesising research evidence. In Studying the Organisation
536	and Delivery of Health Services: Research Methods. London: Routledge.
537	McNeill, C., Távora-Vieira, D., Alnafjan, F., et al. (2012). Tinnitus pitch, masking, and the effectiveness
538	of hearing aids for tinnitus therapy. International Journal of Audiology, 51, 914-919.
539	Noreña, A. J. (2011). An integrative model of tinnitus based on a central gain controlling neural
540	sensitivity. Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 35, 1089-1109.
541	Noreña, A. J., Eggermont, J. J. (2005). Enriched acoustic environment after noise trauma reduces
542	hearing loss and prevents cortical map reorganization. J Neurosci, 25, 699-705.
543	Oz. I., Arslan, F., Hizal, E., et al. (2013). Effectiveness of the combined hearing and masking devices on
544	the severity and perception of tinnitus: a randomized, controlled, double-blind study. ORL J
545	Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec, 75, 211-220.
546	Peltier, E., Peltier, C., Tahar, S., et al. (2012). Long-Term Tinnitus Suppression with Linear Octave
547	Frequency Transposition Hearing Aids. PLOS ONE, 7, e51915.
548	Rocha, A. V., Mondelli, M. F. C. G. (2017). Sound generator associated with the counseling in the
549	treatment of tinnitus: evaluation of the effectiveness. Braz J Otorhinolaryngol, 83, 249-255.
550	Rocha, A. V., Mondelli, M. F. C. G. (2020). Applicability of the real ear measurement for audiological
551	intervention of tinnitus. Brazilian Journal of Otorhinolarynaology, 86, 14-22.
552	Saltzman, M., Ersner, M. S. (1947). A hearing aid for the relief of tinnitus aurium. <i>Larvngoscope</i> , 57.
553	358-366.
554	Searchfield, G. D., Kobavashi, K., Hodgson, SA., et al. (2016). Spatial masking: Development and
555	testing of a new tinnitus assistive technology. Assistive Technology, 28, 115-125.
556	Sereda M Davies I Hall D A (2017) Pre-market version of a commercially available hearing
557	instrument with a tinnitus sound generator: feasibility of evaluation in a clinical trial. Int I
558	Audiol 56, 286-294
559	Sereda M. Hoare D. I. Nicholson R. et al. (2015) Consensus on Hearing Aid Candidature and
560	Eitting for Mild Hearing Loss With and Without Tinnitus: Delphi Review, Ear Hear 36, 417-
561	
562	Sereda M. Via I. El Pofaio A. et al. (2018) Sound therapy (using amplification devices and/or
562	sound gonorators) for tinnitus. Cochrano Databaso Syst Poy. 12, Cd012004
567	Shahana M L Dahhaus A O Abdolmaiood M A at al (2018) (Councelling and amplification with
504	and without fractal music (Zen tones) for management of nations suffering from bacting loss
505	and without nation music (zen tones) for management of patients suffering from hearing loss
ססכ	and unnitus . Hearing, Balance and Communication, 16, 41-55.

567	Shekhawat, G. S., Searchfield, G. D., Kobayashi, K., et al. (2013). Prescription of hearing-aid output for
568	tinnitus relief. <i>Int J Audiol, 52</i> , 617-625.
569	Shekhawat, G. S., Searchfield, G. D., Stinear, C. M. (2013). Role of hearing AIDS in tinnitus
570	intervention: a scoping review. J Am Acad Audiol, 24, 747-762.
571	Shekhawat, G. S., Searchfield, G. D., Stinear, C. M. (2014). Randomized Trial of Transcranial Direct
572	Current Stimulation and Hearing Aids for Tinnitus Management. <i>Neurorehabil Neural Repair,</i>
573	28, 410-419.
574	Shekhawat, G. S., Vanneste, S. (2018). Optimization of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of
575	Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex for Tinnitus: A Non-Linear Dose-Response Effect. <i>Scientific</i>
576	Reports, 8, 8311.
5//	Shetty, H. N., Pottackal, J. M. (2019). Gain adjustment at finnitus pitch to manage both finnitus and
578	speech perception in noise. J Otol, 14, 141-148.
579	Strauss, D. J., Corona-Strauss, F. I., Seidler, H., et al. (2015). Notched environmental sounds: a new
580	hearing aid-supported tinnitus treatment evaluated in 20 patients. 42, 172-175.
581	Surr, R. K., Montgomery, A. A., Mueller, H. G. (1985). Effect of amplification on tinnitus among new
582	hearing aid users. Ear Hear, 6, 71-75.
583	Sweetow, R. W., Sabes, J. H. (2010). Effects of acoustical stimuli delivered through hearing aids on
584	tinnitus. <i>J Am Acad Audiol, 21</i> , 461-473.
585	sweetow, R. W., Sabes, J. H. (2010). An overview of common procedures for the management of
580	tinnitus patients. 63, 11-12,14-15.
50/ E00	rass, P. A., Adamenic, T., Freund, H. J., et al. (2012). Counteracting tinnitus by acoustic coordinated
200	Tutai L. Heare, D. L. Sereda, M. (2018). Combined Amplification and Sound Constation for Tinnitus:
505	A Scoping Poview Far Haar 29, 412, 422
591	Tyler R. S. Deshnande Aniruddha K. Lau Chi C. et al. (2017) The Effectiveness of the Progression
592	of Widey Zen Tinnitus Therapy: A Pilot Study American Journal of Audiology 26, 283-292
593	Van der Wal A Luvten T Cardon E et al (2020) Sex Differences in the Response to Different
597	Tinnitus Treatment 11
595	Vernon I Silverstein H Norrell H (1976) The use of masking for relief of tinnitus Neurological
596	Surgery of the Ear 2 104-118
597	Vernon I.A. Meikle M.B. (2003) Masking devices and alprazolam treatment for tinnitus
598	Otolarvnaol Clin North Am. 36, 307-320, vii.
599	Wegner, L. Hall, D. A., Smit, A. L., et al. (2018). Betahistine for tinnitus. <i>Cochrane Database Syst Rev.</i>
600	12. Cd013093.
601	Yakunina, N., Lee, W. H., Rvu, Y. J., et al. (2019). Tinnitus Suppression Effect of Hearing Aids in
602	Patients With High-frequency Hearing Loss: A Randomized Double-blind Controlled Trial. Otol
603	Neurotol, 40, 865-871.
604	Yokota, Y., Yamashita, A., Koyama, S., et al. (2020). Retrospective evaluation of secondary effects of
605	hearing aids for tinnitus therapy in patients with hearing loss. Auris Nasus Larvnx, 47, 763-
606	768.
607	Zarenoe, R., Hällgren, M., Andersson, G., et al. (2017). Working Memory, Sleep, and Hearing
608	Problems in Patients with Tinnitus and Hearing Loss Fitted with Hearing Aids. J Am Acad
609	Audiol, 28, 141-151.
610	Zarenoe, R., Söderlund, L. L., Andersson, G., et al. (2016). Motivational Interviewing as an Adjunct to
611	Hearing Rehabilitation for Patients with Tinnitus: A Randomized Controlled Pilot Trial. J Am
612	Acad Audiol, 27, 669-676.
642	
613	

614 <u>Figure legends</u>

- 615 Figure 1: Flowchart of the study selection
- 616 Figure 2: Chart of the percentage of studies presenting a significant, positive effect for tinnitus,
- 617 no significant effect, or not applicable due to study aims.



Positive effect

No effect

NA



First author	Year	Control group	Fitting	SG?	Combined therapies	Sample size	Participants	Tinnitus effect?	Study design	Methodology
Andersson	2011	No tinnitus	NA	No	No	85	HA users with and without tinnitus	NA	Retrospective	Cross-sectional, response rate 53%, low tinnitus distress
Peltier	2012	None	LOFT	No	No	74	Tinnitus, HF HL	No	Retrospective	No fixed time points, no clear inclusion and exclusion criteria
MCNeill	2012	None	NA	No	No	70	Bothersome chronic tinnitus	No	Retrospective	
Oz	2013	Only betahistine	NAL-NL1, WB noise	Yes	Counseling	21	Primary complaint chronic tinnitus	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	RCT, all received betahistine, combination device or sound generator
Shekhawat	2013	None	DSL5	No	No	25	HA candidates, chronic tinnitus	NA	Experimental	One time point, no follow up
Shekhawat	2014	Sham tDCS	DSL5	No	tDCS	40	Chronic tinnitus	Yes	Prospective	Same HA, no washout period
dos Santos	2014	Conventional	NAL-NL1, White noise	Yes	Counseling	49	Chronic tinnitus and mild to moderate bilateral SNHL	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	Blind RCT, Same HA
Hodgson	2015	WDRC	DSL5, FC	No	Counseling	16	Chronic tinnitus and HF SNHL	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	Single-blind crossover trial
Henry	2015	Conventional	NAL-NL2, AM and FM noise	Yes	Counseling	30	Bothersome tinnitus, hearing candidate	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	
Strauss	2015	Conventional	Notch	No	TRT	20	Tonal tinnitus	No	Prospective	Double-blind study, objective outcome measure
Jalilvand	2015	Conventional	NAL-NL1	Yes	No	974	Blast-induced chronic tinnitus	NA	Longitudina	All started with combination device
A rau jo	2016	No tinnitus	NA	No	Tinnitus counseling	24	Elderly, moderate SNHL, with and without tinnitus	Yes	Prospective	Same HA, only women with tinnitus
Zarenoe	2016	No MI	NA	No	No	46	Tinnitus, SNHL	Yes, larger effect for MI*	Prospective	RCT, no stratification
Cabral	2016	None	NA	No	No	17	HA users, tinnitus	Yes	Observational	Not all persistent tinnitus (only 58%), different questionnaires pre vs. post
Sereda	2016	None	NA	Yes	No	8	Experienced, satisfied combination device users, chronic tinnitus	NA	Prospective	Same HA

Table 1: Overview of selected studies for this scoping review (HA, hearing aid; SG: sound generator)

Searchfield 7015 TRT-based sound therapy Nesk Counseling 9 Chonic unitatera tinnuts, mildito moderate HF SNHL Bilateral HA users + 5G were to profound HL server to oprofound HL differences Yes Same HA, cross over trail Berberian 2016 None NA Yes No 25 White users + 5G were to profound HL server to profound HL moderate HF SNHL server to profound HL differences Yes, no group moderate HF SNHL server to profound HL differences Prospective Same HA, cross over trail Rocha 2017 Sound generator NAL NLL white Yes Counseling Same HA Same HA Same HA Zarence 2017 No tinnitus NA No No No Same HA White Interviewing Wash differences Yes, no group differences Prospective Same HA, brand and moder differences Same HA, cross over trail Zarence 2017 No tinnitus Na No No No Same HA											
Berberian2016NoneNAYesNo25Bilateral Ha users 45G with bilateral tinnitus 45G severe to profound HLYesRetrospectiveRocha2017Sound generatorWAL NL1, molseYesCounseling30Bilateral chronic tinnitusYes, no group differencesProspectiveSame HA brand and modelZarenoe2017No tinnitusNANoNo92Mild to moderate SHL, with and without tinnitusYesProspectiveSame HA brand and modelTyler2017NoneZen tonesYesZen Tinnitus Therapy20Chronic tinnitusYesProspectiveSame brand, not everybody same trajectory, n 7 a ratedy HA before studyHenry2017ConventionalNAL-NL2, EHWAYesCounseling, Relaxation40SNH, chronic terver bothersome tinnitusYes, no group differencesProspectiveMonoauraly fitted, same brand trajectory, n 7 a ratedy HA before studyShabana2018ConventionalRAL-NL2, EHWAYesCounseling, RelaxationSNH, chronic terver bothersome tinnitusYes, no group differencesProspectiveMonoauraly fitted, same brand torues*Shetty2019NoneNAL-NL2 or DSLSNoNo94Chronic tinnitus, SNH, terver with HAI, bi atera SNH, chronic terver on DSLSProspectiveDouble bi Ind CT, same brand fitting, SPIN material validated?Yakunina2019NoneNAL-NL2 or DSLSNoNo34Shile chronic tinnit	Searchfield	2016	TRT-based sound therapy	DSL5, 3D masking	Yes	Counseling	9	Chronic unilateral tinnitus, mild to moderate HF SNHL	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	Same HA, cross over trail
Rocha2017Sound generatorNAL-NL1, moiseYesCounseling30Bilateral chronic tinnitusYes, no group differencesProspectiveSame HA brand and modelZarenoe2017No tinnitusNANoNo92Milid to moderate SNHL, with and without tinnitusYesProspectiveProspectiveMotivational interviewing was delivered to some patients Izarenoe et a, 2016)Tyler2017NoneZen tonesYesZen Tinnitus20chronic tinnitusYesProspectiveSame HA brand, not everybody same trajectory, n = 7 already HA before studyHenry2017NoneNAL-NL2, EHWAYesCounseling, RelaxationMilid to moderate-y- severe hearing ocs, bothersome tinnitusYes, no group (Fer or Zen tores*ProspectiveRCT, same brandShabana2018ConventionalZen toneYesCounseling, RelaxationSNHL, chronic 	Berberian	2016	None	NA	Yes	No	25	Bilateral HA users + SG with bilateral tinnitus, no severe to profound HL.	Yes	Retrospective	
Zarenoe2017No tinnitusNANoNo92Mild to moderate SNHL, with and without tinnitusYesProspetiveMotivational interviewing was delivered to some patients (Zarenoe et al 2016)Tyler2017NoneZen tonesYesZen Tinnitus20Chronic tinnitusYesProspetiveSame brand, not everybody same trajectory, n = 7 already HA before studyHenry2017ConventionalNAL-NL2, EHWAYesCounseling55Mild to moderately- 	Rocha	2017	Sound generator	NAL-NL1, White noise	Yes	Counseling	30	Bilateral chronic tinnitus	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	Same HA brand and model
Tyler 2017 None Zen tones Yes Zen Tinnitus Therapy 20 Chronic tinnitus Yes Prospective Prospective Same brand, not everybody same trajectory, n = 7 arready HA before study Henry 2017 Conventional NAL-NL2, EHWA Yes Counseling Simila to moderately, bothersome tinnitus Yes, no group differences Prospective RCT, same brand, not everybody same trajectory, n = 7 arready HA before study Shabana 2018 Conventional XAL-NL2, EHWA Yes Ocunseling, Relaxation 40 SNHL, chronic bothersome tinnitus Yes, no group effect for Zen tones* Prospective Monoauraly fitted, same brand tones* Yakunina 2019 VDRC FT vs. LFT No No 94 Chronic tinnitus, SNHL (even with HA), bilateral (even with	Zarenoe	2017	No tinnitus	NA	No	No	92	Mild to moderate SNHL, with and without tinnitus	Yes	Prospective	Motivational interviewing was delivered to some patients (Zarenoe et al, 2016)
Henry2017ConventionalNAL-NL2, EHWAYesCounseling55Mild to moderately- sperter hearing loss, bothersome tinnitusYes, no group differencesProspectiveRCT, same brandShabana2018ConventionalZen toneYesCounseling, RelaxationSNHL, chronic bothersome tinnitusYes, larger effect for Zen tones*ProspectiveMonoaurally fitted, same brand tones*Yakunia2019WDRCFT vs. LFTNoNo94Chronic tinnitus, SNHLYes, no group offerencesProspectiveDouble-blind RCT, same brand tones*Shetty2019NoneNal-NL2 or DSLSNoNo94Chronic tinnitus, (even with HA), bilateral SNHLNAProspectiveDouble-blind RCT, same brand tones*Haab2019ConventionalNate-NoNo94Chronic tinnitus, (even with HA), bilateral SNHLNAProspectiveDouble-blind RCT, same brand tones*Yokota2019ConventionalNotchNoNo20Catastrophic tinnitus (even with HA), bilateral SNHLNAProspectiveFest of Tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated?Yokota2019ConventionalNotchNoNo34Subjective chronic tonal moderate HLGroup differences at 6m*ProspectiveFest of Tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated?Yokota2020NoneNANoNoSolAPrimary complaint of stable, to	Tyler	2017	None	Zen tones	Yes	Zen Tinnitus Therapy	20	Chronic tinnitus	Yes	Prospective	Same brand, not everybody same trajectory, n = 7 already HA before study
Shabana 2018 Conventional Zen tones Yes Counseling, Relaxation 40 SNHL, chronic bothersome tinnitus Yes, larger effect for Zen tones* Prospective Monoaurally fitted, same brand Yakunia 2019 WDRC FT vs. LFT No No 94 Chronic tinnitus, SNHL Yes, larger effect for Zen tones* Prospective Double-blind RCT, same brand Shetty 2019 None NAL-NL2 or DSL5 No No 20 Catastrophic tinnitus (even with HA), bilateral SNHL NA Prospective Test of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated? Haab 2019 Conventional Notch No No 34 Subjective chronic tonal moderate HL Group differences at moderate HL Prospective Frest of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated? Yokota 2020 None NA No No 66 Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitus Prospective Retrospective Prospective Double blind Marcrum 2020 Conventional No.th No No 89 Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHL No Prospective	Henry	2017	Conventional	NAL-NL2, EHWA	Yes	Counseling	55	Mild to moderately- severe hearing loss, bothersome tinnitus	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	RCT, same brand
Yakunina2019WDRCFT vs. LFTNoNo94Chronic tinnitus, SNHLYes, no group differencesProspectiveDouble-blind RCT, same brandShetty2019None $\frac{NAL-NL2}{or DSL5}$ NoNo20 $\frac{Catastrophic tinnitus}{(even with HA), bilateral}}{SNHL}$ NAProspectiveTest of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated?Haab2019ConventionalNotchNoNo34Subjective chronic tonal moderate HLGroup differences at moderate HLProspectiveProspectiveYokota2020NoneNAANoNo66Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitusProspectiveRetrospectiveFersopectiveMarcrum2020ConventionalNotchNoNo89Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHLNoProspectiveDouble blindRocha2020NoneNoneNoNo89Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHLNoProspectiveDouble blindRocha2020NoneNoneNoNo89Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHLSourceProspectiveDouble blindRocha2020NoneNoneNoNo80Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHLSourceProspectiveDouble blindRocha2020NoneNon	Shabana	2018	Conventional	Zen tones	Yes	Counseling, Relaxation	40	SNHL, chronic bothersome tinnitus	Yes, arger effect for Zen tones*	Prospective	Monoaurally fitted, same brand
Shetty 2019 None NAL-NL2 or DSL5 No No 20 Catastrophic tinnitus (even with HA), bilateral SNHL NA Prospective Test of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated? Haab 2019 Conventional Notch No No 34 Subjective chronic tonal tinnitus, mild to moderate HL Group differences at moderate HL Prospective Prospective Fest of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated? Yokota 2020 None NA No No 66 Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitus Yes Retrospective Fest of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated? Marcrum 2020 None NA No No 66 Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitus Yes Retrospective Fest of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated? Marcrum 2020 Conventional Notch No No S0 S0 Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHL No Prospective Double blind Double blind Rocha 2020 None NoL-NL1, white Yes Prospective Same HA	Yakunina	2019	WDRC	FT vs. LFT	No	No	94	Chronic tinnitus, SNHL	Yes, no group differences	Prospective	Double-blind RCT, same brand
Haab2019ConventionalNotchNoNoNo34Subjective chronic tonal tinnitus, mild to moderate HLGroup differences at 6m*ProspectiveYokota2020NoneNANoNo66Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitusYesRetrospectiveMarcrum2020ConventionalNotchNoNo66Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitusYesRetrospectiveMarcrum2020ConventionalNotchNoNo66Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHLYesRetrospectiveRocha2020NoneNotchYesCounseling40Chronic bilateral tinnitus and symmetrical bilateral mild to moderate SNHLYesProspectiveSame HA	Shetty	2019	None	NAL-NL2 or DSL5	No	No	20	Catastrophic tinnitus (even with HA), bilateral SNHL	NA	Prospective	Test of tinnitus suppression during fitting, SPIN material validated?
Yokota 2020 None NA No No No 66 Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitus Yes Retrospective Retrospective Marcrum 2020 Conventional Notch No No 39 Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHL No Prospective Double blind Rocha 2020 None No No Prospective Prospective Double blind Rocha 2020 None No No Prospective Prospective Double blind Rocha 2020 None No Prospective Prospective Same HA	Haab	2019	Conventional	Notch	No	No	34	Subjective chronic tonal tinnitus, mild to moderate HL	Group differences at 6m*	Prospective	
Marcrum 2020 Conventional Notch No No 39 Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to-moderate SNHL Prospective Double blind Rocha 2020 None Nal-NL1, White noise Yes Counseling 40 Add symmetrical bilateral mild to moderate SNHL Yes Prospective Same HA	Yokota	2020	None	NA	No	No	66	Primary complaint hearing disturbance, tinnitus	Yes	Retrospective	
NAL-NL1, Chronic bilateral tinnitus Rocha 2020 None White Yes Counseling 40 and symmetrical bilateral Yes Prospective Same HA noise mild to moderate SNHL Kes Kes <t< td=""><td>Marcrum</td><td>2020</td><td>Conventional</td><td>Notch</td><td>No</td><td>No</td><td>39</td><td>Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHL</td><td>Νο</td><td>Prospective</td><td>Double blind</td></t<>	Marcrum	2020	Conventional	Notch	No	No	39	Primary complaint of stable, tonal tinnitus, bilateral mild-to- moderate SNHL	Νο	Prospective	Double blind
	Rocha	2020	None	NAL-NL1, White noise	Yes	Counseling	40	Chronic bilateral tinnitus and symmetrical bilateral mild to moderate SNHL	Yes	Prospective	Same HA